# FELLOWSHIP

September 1944 Vol. X—No. 9

## Non-Violence Goes Latin

By DEVERE ALLEN

## The Use of Force

By PAUL A. REYNOLDS

•

## Problems of Relocation

By JOSEPH B. HUNTER

## Blockade of Hate

By ENRICO C. S. MOLNÁR

•

## The Direction of Growth

By A. J. MUSTE

"The policy of reducing Germany to servitude for a generation, of degrading the lives of millions of human beings, and of depriving a whole nation of happiness should be abhorrent and detestable — abhorrent and detestable, even if it were possible, even if it enriched ourselves, even if it did not sow the decay of the whole civilized life of Europe. Some preach it in the name of Justice. In the great events of man's history, in the unwinding of the complex fates of nations Justice is not so simple. And if it were, nations are not authorized, by religion or by natural morals, to visit on the children of their enemies the misdoings of parents or of rulers."

JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES

(From *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*, 1919.)

15 cents a copy $1.50 a year

# John Haynes Holmes

That was a pathetic letter published in the *New York Herald Tribune* a while ago, signed by "A Mother," and entitled by the editor, "Missing in Action."

The letter was a heart-rending lament over the death of a son in battle. But it was more than a lament! It was a passionate protest against the killing of this "handsome lad." The mother tells how she and her husband "have worked and loved and dreamed for [the boy] these twenty-four years, how happy [they] were that he went to college, that he was engaged to marry a sweet, good girl, and that he had a a fine job waiting when he came back." And now he is dead, and this heart-broken mother wants to know why. "I want the answer," she cries. "For what has that clean, fine young life, with all its possibilities, been sacrificed?"

She gets no answer from the editor of the *Herald Tribune,* who at least had the grace to publish the letter. I think of the tens of thousands of parents of sons in service who will read this mother's complaint. Have they an answer to her challenge? I imagine the officers of government in Washington who took us into this war—or at least consented to our going—I imagine their reading this letter, and then try to guess what kind of an answer they would give. Of course, they must have an answer, for they told us that we must fight. But would it be an answer that would satisfy this stricken mother?

This recalls a discussion in a recent book, Rex Warner's *Return of the Traveller.* In this story, the author presents the situation of a soldier, killed in battle, coming back in spirit to find an answer to the question as to why he was killed. In a cathedral, by the grave of an Unknown Soldier, he makes contact with a group of sight-seers, and through the mystic mediation of a priest gets them talking on this question. A typical English gentleman thinks that patriotism is enough. A cynical mechanic scoffs at this idea of country, and finds nothing in a war "worth getting killed for." Why is a soldier killed?—because he was taken away against his will and "got hit with something—that's all there is about it." A refugee in the group protests at this, and declares that a soldier dies to defend us all from "terrible things. . . . He defends culture, civilization, progress." A middle-aged man demurs, and talks about "the folly and incapacity of government." But from this condemnation of the past he turns to the future and its promise of a better world. "It is in the fight for such a world," he says, "rather than in any form of defense, that killing may be justified." This is answered by a sad-eyed mother: "This soldier," she exclaims, "I would tell him that he died for the sins of the whole world. He meant no harm. Nor did we. But we all killed him, and he killed himself."

It is startling to note how identical is this cry of the mother in Mr. Warner's book with that of the real mother writing in the *Herald Tribune.* "Out of my first drowning grief," says the real mother, "has risen this firm conviction. I have no right to expect God to save my son when we are breaking his laws by killing one another. It is wrong, you all know in your hearts it is wrong. . . . God gave us a beautiful world and a pattern of living that was perfect. Our stubborn way leads only to greed for power and slaughter. Why can't we at least try His way just once? Let us resolve that out of the world's agony of today will be born a world in which we will reason with our brother but not kill him if he wants something that we want, too."

In Rex Warner's book there is an attempt to bring order into the confusion of this discussion in a final discourse by the understanding priest. The discourse has dignity and beauty, but it is no more satisfactory as an answer to the young soldier's question, "Why was I killed?" than the majestic discourse of Jehovah in answer to Job's question as to why he suffered so many ills. Through it all runs the thought of the wonder of the world and the goodness of human living as set over against the sheer horror of war. The priest seems to have the same idea as the *Herald Tribune* mother, in the concluding sentences of her letter quoted above, when he says:

"I am thinking of the enormous goodness and beauty and fascination of life, all the sights and sounds and colors, tastes in the mouth, textures of things touched, the warmth and tenderness of love, the delight in the mind's insight and exploration, the sweetness of some moods, a million things which you will readily imagine. And side by side with this I envisage the most elaborate apparatus of destruction, twisted metal, broken bodies, a whole curriculum of slaughter in which men and women are trained from their early youth."

Strangely enough, this dead soldier had caught this same vision of a wondrous world as he died upon the battlefield. He had seen, just in this last earthly moment, "how unutterably splendid was the whole depth and array of life, how limitless were its horizons, how sweetly thrilling were its humblest aspects."

Does this glimpse of beauty, as set over against the grim reality of war, resolve in some mystic way, as the priest in the story seems to think, the contradiction between them? Does "the enormous goodness of life" embrace the battlefield and make it one with the whole world of beauty, and thus give war a place "within the will of God?"

I cannot see it so. The contradiction stands. "The beauty of life" is itself the final condemnation of war. Just because the world is in essence so beautiful, and life so sweet and good, we know war to be irreconcilable with the will of God. Not the priest in the book, who is only Rex Warner at his desk philosophizing, but the *Herald Tribune* mother, who is in the throes of life and death, has laid hold upon the truth. There is no reason why a young lad should be conscripted and slain, save as we persist in following "our stubborn way [which] leads only to greed for power and slaughter."

Not our way, but thine, O God! "Why can't we at least try His way just once?"


## FELLOWSHIP

Published by the
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, A. J. MUSTE } *Editors*
J. ELLIOTT FINLAY *Managing Editor*



EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Vera Brittain
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Eugene Exman
Caleb Foote
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Helene Hale
John Haynes Holmes
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Ferner Nuhn
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Edwin McNeill Poteat
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman



FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Reentered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

15 Cents a Copy $1.50 a Year

# FELLOWSHIP

*THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION*

**September 1944** **Vol. X—No. 9**


**A new revolutionary technique is overthrowing the dictators of Central America**

# Non-violence Goes Latin

By DEVERE ALLEN*

TWO of the toughest dictatorships in the world have been broken recently by deliberately non-violent revolutions, and two others have been compelled to make gestures toward increased democracy. The scene of these significant new social experiments was not India, and their inspiration was not Gandhi, except in the most indirect manner. But as a result, President-Dictator Maximiliano Hernández Martínez of El Salvador, and President-Dictator Jorge Ubico of Guatemala are in exile. And Presidents-Dictators Tiburcio Carías of Honduras and Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua have been shivering under the tropic sun and trying to act, albeit with fumbling unfamiliarity, like democrats.

The Salvadoran "President" in more than a few respects resembled Adolf Hitler. He was a mystic, holding theosophist doctrines which he tried for a time to put into the school curriculum. He was an ascetic—a strict vegetarian, devoted to quiet study in his library. He doted on good music, which he played on his own piano. He liked to place brightly tinted water in the sun, then give it to his friends for its supposed curative qualities; many a visitor has gone away bearing a bottle of *agua azul* after a polite turn-down of some humane request.

This New World martinet came to power by an armed seizure of authority back in 1931. After less than one year in office, he faced a revolt of impoverished peasants asking for agrarian reform, and he allowed land-owning butchers, backed by the army, to shoot down literally thousands. Budgetary balances were his fetish, along with the prevention of graft by petty officials. He organized a Pro Patria party and saw, by whatever force was necessary, that no other political organization was allowed to develop. He pulled off a fake election in 1935, and when in 1939 he ran into a constitutional provision that prevented a legal third term, he simply promulgated a new constitution which declared that "the citizen who shall exercise the presidency from March 1 of the present year shall continue in power to January 1, 1945."

Genuine democrats in El Salvador found this situation debasing and intolerable. Among them were leaders with high-minded idealism, courageous and self-sacrificing. Though conscious of the serious personal consequences that might result, 300 of them signed a manifesto in the fall of 1943 and gave it the widest possible circulation. It asked the nation's judicial officials to interpret the Salvadoran constitution so as to conform in practice to its guarantees of free public assembly, free speech, and unhampered expression of popular political desires.

It is interesting in the light of subsequent events to note that this manifesto, to quote a Worldover Press report, was issued chiefly by the group known as the Democratic Action, "which has renounced violence as a means of securing more democratic rights, while condemning the regime as essentially violent." They were against violence both because they felt it was unlikely to succeed, and because it would damage too seriously the country's hopes for an eventual regime of democracy and order.

As weeks went by, the Dictator's policy of self-perpetuation in office became more and more clear, and as democratic protests mounted, his stubbornness and heavy-handed rule became increasingly oppressive. On April 2, 1944, Martínez and his family set out for a holiday at La Libertad, the celebrated beach resort. "Liberty" was, under the circumstances, an ironic destination. The very next day the President rushed frantically back to the capital, San Salvador, to put down a revolt which apparently had broken out spontaneously, but which actually had been planned for days.

## Military Revolution Fails

Though wishing to avoid a military revolution, the revolutionary elements were nevertheless faced with a dilemma. The Dictator had risen to power by virtue of his army connections. There was doubt that he could be overthrown without the cooperation of all possible factions inside the Army which had grown weary of his high-handedness. Hence, quiet conversations were held between political and military rebels, and the April political upheaval began with the military as its spearhead. This appears to have been an accident of fate, since the political revolutionary leaders have made it clear that they intended no bloodshed; they expected to take the Dictator into captivity by a "palace revolution" and accomplish a change of rule without physical harm to anyone. But violence broke out and spread

*An FOR member who is a news reporter, author, and Editor of *Worldover Press.*

like a prairie fire. It has even been charged by the United Press (and not refuted) that lend-lease military planes and tanks, characteristically employed by Latin American dictators to keep down revolts, were captured in this instance by revolutionary army officers and turned against the government.

This rebellion was brutally suppressed. The government arrested real or fancied revolutionaries wholesale. It admitted 53 deaths, and did not deny a series of group executions which often went on at the rate of a dozen a day. Torture was another weapon relied on by the Dictator's cohorts to extract from certain arrested rebels the names of their comrades. One young man, horribly maimed, held out to the last. When led out to be shot, he was asked by a priest, "My boy, are you afraid to die?" "No, Father," he replied, "it is only my body that trembles, not my spirit." One 17-year-old citizen of the United States had been shot in the back by careless and brutal police on the streets, a fact which made it possible for U. S. Ambassador Thurston to manifest disapproval of the government forces, thus helping to reassure popular opinion. When the shooting died down it was estimated by sober Salvadorans that nearly 3,000 had been killed.

But the prisons were bursting with even more. And the regime, despite its triumph, began a systematic search to round up every "dangerous" person of democratic mind. At this stage, which continued into May, several decisive events occurred. One was the intervention of the Roman Catholic Church. Let it be said to the credit of the Church that even much earlier it had abandoned its historic neutrality, as it had during the war of independence from 1811 to 1821. It decided to make its power felt throughout the country, and on the side of the revolution. Church dignitaries protested the Dictator's brutality to his face, only to be rebuffed. Priests hid many a man sought by the police, sometimes helping rebels to escape over the border wearing priestly robes.

## Non-violent Resistance Wins

Meantime, on May 3, Dr. Arturo Romero was captured while trying to escape from the country. He was condemned to death. *Excelsior,* the daily newspaper of Mexico City, reported that the doctors of the entire country might strike if the execution were carried out. Dr. Romero is a brilliant young physician who has studied in Paris, and is widely beloved. (He seems destined now to be the leading contender for the presidency in the election slated for next January.) Around his personality there grew up a steadily increasing mass strike, to prevent his being sent to death, and to topple the dictatorial authorities. From various sections of the press throughout Latin America came stern warnings and sharp protests. University students began a general strike and all business houses in San Salvador closed down as a means of showing the President that his executions were insufferable.

Dr. Romero, who recently visited New York to get treatment for a serious wound suffered in the uprising, stated in an interview with a friend of the present writer that this was probably the first revolution in world history in which bankers, industrialists, and the entire commercial class openly and voluntarily joined with students and labor in a mass revolutionary strike. Everywhere the workers, organized and unorganized, did their best to impede the government. All transportation ceased. Offices, stores and banks closed. No one bought the newspapers owned or controlled by the governing clique. The dictator was in an impossible position, and on May 9 he resigned and fled to Guatemala, where he was offered hospitality as an exile by his former fellow-student of military affairs, Dictator Jorge Ubico.

A temporary President, the former Minister of War, Andrés Ignacio Menéndez, was chosen, and despite his earlier connections he has shown responsiveness to the public will. Salvadorans are now busily at work trying to restore the structure of a democratic state and to learn democratic procedures in which they have grown rusty through the years.

Arriving at San Salvador twelve hours after the Dictator had renounced his rule, Cesar Ortiz, a friend of the writer and an experienced Associated Press reporter stationed in Costa Rica, wrote in a number of publications, among them *El Informador* of Guadalajara, Mexico, an excellent and interesting interpretation of events. "The efficient application of passive resistance," he says, "the death of a young man of North American origin, and a strange kind of collective fear, constituted important factors in the recent fall of the ex-president of El Salvador. Now, El Salvador after the frustrated rebellion of the second of April and the triumphant 'passive rebellion' of April 24 and subsequent days, finds itself in the midst of an experiment in democracy after 11 years of an iron-handed dictatorship.

"Here is the situation as told to me by shoe-shine boys to bankers. After the revolution of April 2 had been put down and several of its leaders, including Col. Tito Calvo, had been killed, a great fear took hold of the country. The people believed that the shootings were just the beginning of a nightmare; they feared the vengeance of Martínez. 'It was this collective fear,' an owner of coffee plantations told me, 'that made us brave.' The students of the University, 500 strong, launched the strike the 24th of April. Hospital employees and doctors carried it on. Lawyers ceased their practice. The stores and markets and later the banks closed their doors. The railroads stopped the departure of all trains. The regular buses suspended their services. . . . There was a total suspension of activities, an absolute paralyzation of the economic and social life of the country. . . . Soon afterwards, a student demonstration was dispersed by force which resulted in the death of a boy, Joseph Wright, son of John Wright of California, and a Salvadoran mother. No fewer than 5,000 persons attended the funeral. It was one of the final straws. Martínez had to go."

An editorial in San Salvador's Catholic weekly, *Criterio* asserted that "The history of nations is full of revolutions but we do not recall a single civic and patriotic movement which came to a head so spontaneously, without any sort of partnership, without personal or group interests, without hatred or violences, and without the instigation of professional politicians or of men with personal ambition. The Salvadoran people have written one of the most splendid pages in their history."

## Guatemala Follows Example

What the ousted dictator of El Salvador told his close friend, the Dictator of Guatemala, is not known. But the message that he conveyed could match the stentorian sentences that had been spoken by the implacable people

El Salvador, however indirectly, to the long oppressed people of Guatemala. Immediately, down among the masses, a seething unrest began to spread. It did not become vocal until it was expressed by university students, who dramatically went on strike in June. But even the best-informed observers sagely shook their heads and said, privately, "They can get away with it in El Salvador, but never here. If Martínez was tough, Ubico is ten times tougher!" But the people of Guatemala did not make the mistake of attempting to fight the government by its own military methods, in which its resources were infinitely greater. Profiting from the experience of the little country next door, they held firmly to non-violent revolution.

Making the preposterous charge that the student agitation was inspired by Nazis, Dictator Ubico on June 22 suspended all constitutional guarantees of public assembly, freedom of speech and press, and other constitutional articles which might favor popular expression. In thus seeking to suppress the student demonstrations Ubico reckoned without the prestige which university undergraduates have always had in Spanish and Spanish-American lands. Traditionally, for the better part of the last century, university students have been in the forefront of popular struggles, usually on the side of freedom. Rarely, though, have they been non-violent; rather, quite the contrary. But in this instance the students of Guatemala were in deadly earnest and knew precisely what they wanted. They wanted revolution, and they wanted to achieve it by peaceful means.

In a few days more, the repressive measures instituted by the government resulted in a sympathy strike by transportation workers, who stopped the trains and other means of transportation. Almost at once the banks closed their doors and stores pulled down their shutters. Women came out to demonstrate in support of the students, and their gathering was broken up by police, who wounded and killed several persons. Violence on the part of the regime was general. The masses, nevertheless, chiefly depended upon their solidarity. Martial law was declared. The killings, the arrests, the tightening of governmental controls, had no effect. The shriller and "tougher" the government became, the weaker it appeared in actuality. Streets became completely deserted. It was not long before the Dictator, when pressing buttons, received no answer. He was an isolated, frustrated ruler. He had only one choice —to go. He went.

Thus, after a harsh, stern rule of more than 13 years, during which he had admittedly made Guatemala City one of the cleanest civic centers in all the world, and had stamped out all kinds of graft on the part of public officials, Jorge Ubico was finished. The good things he had accomplished were far outweighed by his continuous one-man regimentation of the people. Although a military junta was now put into office, it immediately announced, in response to universal popular pressure, that it would hold power for a short time only, would constitute a new cabinet, and would make plans for the calling of a new Constituent Assembly in preparation for democratic elections.

Already the overturn in Guatemala has brought a number of interesting economic developments. On July 18 the United Fruit Company, gigantic ruler of the destinies of thousands of workers in this "banana republic," announced a 15 per cent increase in wages and various improvements in living conditions. Within a week thereafter, still dissatisfied, 5,000 workers went on strike demanding a further wage increase to match the rising cost of living. The government was reported as sympathetic, and one foreign corporation after another tumbled over itself in its eagerness to comply with new wage demands and to satisfy the eagerness of the depressed workers of Guatemala for a higher living standard.

It may be doubted whether Latin Americans generally, or even the citizens of El Salvador and Guatemala, fully realize the social significance of this non-violent revolutionary technique. Quite probably, none the less, their experience will become more meaningful as they analyze it, and reap its fruits. And the neighboring dictators are fully aware of its irresistible power.

## Other Dictatorships Totter

Among Central American countries, only little Costa Rica, in recent times, has been progressive and truly democratic. Honduras has felt the heavy heel of a ruthless dictator, Tiburcio Carías, for a dozen years. Part of the price Carías has to pay for his totalitarian methods of government is his reliance on machine guns for protection, even when he attends church services. The truth about his rule might not be known to the outside world were it not for a coterie of oppositionists, many of them of high calibre, who are compelled to live in exile in Mexico but keep unbelievably well informed about the most intimate details of affairs at home. Numerous exiled citizens of Honduras in Costa Rica are also seeking to capitalize on the prestige of the overturns in El Salvador and Guatemala, and are working day and night for a passive resistance revolt in their oppressed homeland.

Carías, acting in accord with the Ubico pattern, has denounced all of his opponents as Nazi agitators, though everyone knows better. Yet he has succeeded in postponing the convocation of the legislature beyond the constitutional date, and in suppressing numerous strikes and demonstrations. However, it appears unlikely, in the light of the gathering storm, that President Carías will much longer be able to hold down the dictatorial chair, even with his reputed 260 pounds.

In Nicaragua the dictatorship of President Anastasio Somoza, which until recently had been running like a well-oiled machine, has begun to emit creaking sounds and to show signs of faltering. Student demonstrations there have been smashed, though with less bloodshed than in El Salvador, Guatemala, or Honduras. Women demonstrators have been attacked, with official approval, by women of the underworld and driven off the streets. Obviously frightened by what had happened to his counterparts in El Salvador and Guatemala, however, President Somoza has vetoed a bill recently put through the National Assembly, which would have extended his constitutional term as head of the state. By means of this astonishing reversal, and by the granting of various economic reforms as sops to an aroused public opinion, he hopes to remain in office until he can choose a successor amenable to his "discipline."

Neither in Nicaragua nor Honduras have the revolutionary forces yet gathered anything like the momentum or solidarity displayed in El Salvador and Guatemala. But the end is not yet. Though imperfect and unsure in ideology, this non-violent technique is something fresh and full of promise as an alternative to the countless bloody revolutions in Latin America's past.

A CO answers Form 47's question: Under what circumstances, if any, do you believe in—

# The Use of Force

By PAUL A. REYNOLDS*

INASMUCH as there are various meanings to the term "force," I think it important that distinctions be made. There are, as I understand the matter, at least three types of force: logical force, moral force, and physical force. Parliamentarian or political procedures involve, characteristically, the first and second—logical and moral force. When logical force is codified, under the guidance of basic principles of morality, we have legal force. Personal and social relations involve, characteristically, these two as well. Military procedures involve, characteristically, the last—physical force. There are other types of force, perhaps, under other principles of classification, or involving a combination of these types. There is, for example, economic pressure. The term "force," as used in the context of this questionnaire, refers, as I understand it, to physical force. Since the exercise of physical force by armies and navies is the exercise not only of physical force, but of "studied *killing* physical force," the use of this particular type of force is, as I understand it, the crucial point of this question.

Whether parents or teachers should or should not use physical force in disciplining children is not primarily involved in the question; there is surely no one who would say that parents or teachers may ever justifiably use killing physical force in their treatment of children. When used with love and knowledge, in the personal and physical welfare of the individuals involved, physical force is, under some circumstances, in such personal relations, I believe, justifiable.

It is likewise fully agreed by all conscientious citizens, I assume, that the use of practiced, studied, and skilled killing physical force is not justifiable in the relations of adult to adult; murder is wrong. The question of personal self-defense or self-preservation, under violent attack, is, accordingly, not primarily at issue.

The question of physical restraint of the mentally ill is, likewise, as I understand it, not here at issue; for the question of the use of killing physical force with respect to the mentally ill is at present no issue of public policy.

The question would then seem to center chiefly on the point of *whether I believe a man is ever justified, when acting as the agent of some society or group, in using studied killing physical force when there are conflicts of interests between individual and group or group and group —i.e., in partisan controversies.* The questions of (1) industrial struggle, (2) the relationship between an individual and the state, (3) civil struggle and (4) the relationship between states—these, at least, are clearly, then, centrally involved in the question. Let us consider these in order.

(1) *Industrial disputes.* I do not believe in the use of killing physical force in industrial disputes. The use of arms by the litigants in a partisan controversy is as wrong as murder. Only parliamentary procedures—logical and legal and moral force—are here in accordance with my conscience.

(2) *The individual and the state.* There are at least two situations in which planned killing physical force conceivably may be used, as I analyze the problem, in the relationship between an individual and the state. In the first place, there may be the question of whether a doctor should be permitted, as the agent of the state, and in the conscientious practice of his legalized profession, to use killing physical force upon a patient. I am not sure that I could not, as such a doctor, accept such a responsibility; I believe that I could conscientiously approve of a fully qualified person so serving the state. Such approval would depend, however, upon the use of this force with great love and knowledge. I should find myself, I believe, lacking in the love and knowledge necessary to assume any such responsibility, and heavily sensitive against willingly undertaking, whatever my skill or training, any practice of medicine with any such license. Men of the medical profession have very carefully preserved the conviction, I believe, that theirs is exclusively a healing art. It seems to me that this long guarded item of the medical ethics is basically sound. One thinks with great apprehension of the breakdown of confidence that would occur—trust of patient in doctor—if there should be any legal and moral sanctioning of euthanasia.

In the second place, there may be the question of whether a policeman, as an example of one of the many officers of the law, should be permitted, as the agent of the state, and in the conscientious practice of his profession, to use killing physical force in the event of resistance to arrest. I am less sure that I could conscientiously accept such an assignment, than that I could practice euthanasia, although there is a strong parallel between a licensed doctor and any other agent of the state. I am less sure, chiefly, I think, because of my conviction that civil order could be maintained not only as well, but even better, with far less use of killing physical force. I think, specifically, of the abolition of lethal weapons in the hands of policemen, and of the abolition of capital punishment.

But the use of studied killing physical force by the officers of the state in relation to an individual is quite a different matter from war. War, as I understand it, including food blockades, involves indiscriminate, mass killing. It is engaged in by individuals who are under commission by a group, to be sure. But soldiers are not, as are policemen, for example, under commission by an authority to which *both* litigants to the dispute acknowledge temporal sovereignty, and from which these litigants receive their civil or legal and, in part, their moral, status. In the case of war, skilled, deliberate, killing physical force is the court of last appeal. In the case of the police power, there is a legal, logical, moral, parliamentary tribunal over and above, defining the limits and restraining the use of

*An FOR member, now a professor at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

killing physical force, with the intention of establishing individual guilt, and safeguarding the lives of innocent parties. War knows no such legalities and refinements of justice. Going to war is like arming the litigants instead of the police, and then making them the jury, the judges, and even the beneficiaries of any fines to be collected. Accordingly, I cannot understand how there may be in theory a "just war"; and I do not see that those who make such a distinction in theory are able to observe it in practice.

(3) *Civil War.* The principle here is the same as in the case of industrial disputes; the parties are usually, however, larger in numbers, and are drawn primarily on political or social rather than primarily on specifically economic lines. I find myself unable to believe in the use of studied killing physical force between group and group, in a partisan controversy; for here, in contrast with the case of the exercise of police power, by the very realities of the situation the authority of the state has so crumbled that only a basic democratic, popular, logical, moral re-organization of society can avail. What is then needed is thinking about first constitutional principles; but not mass killing. The very source of human social cohesion—reason—must re-produce, re-nourish, and re-establish community organization. The fount of any just authority of killing force, even granting there can be such a human fount, must first be re-created. Until then force can only beget greater chaos. So I could not participate in civil war.

Police power has the approval of a substantial majority in the community where it operates. If it is maintained by such approval, it ascends to the level of value. If not, it is beneath the level of value and is devoid of the true character of police power. Killing force is then its own sanction—which means, for the religious person, that it is unsanctioned.

But what is one to do if a dictatorship rules, or a military conqueror? In preparation for a reply to this question, one might first ask some other questions. What should the Government of Denmark have done when the German Army marched in? Declare war? What should members of the opposition do in Nazi Germany? Must one resort to arms at any cost? Is there no limit to the trust that one should put in military procedures? Is one still to use physical force if he is imprisoned by a tyrant—in a modern concentration camp, perchance? The fact that even advocates of lethal procedures would counsel waiting until there is a fair chance of a successful revolt would show that not even such advocates believe that all is lost when arms are lost. Non-violent non-cooperation, calm, patient suffering are still possible—as they were possible for the early Christians under the persecution of Roman dictatorship, or for the unarmed Quakers in Colonial Pennsylvania, who for seventy years were safe from attack by Indians while in all the other Colonies armed white men suffered massacres. A Christian believes that even God, when confronted with great evil, could not overcome evil with evil, but "so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son." If even God could not overcome evil with killing physical force, who is man to presume that he can do with his finite power what is not possible for God with his infinite power?

(4) *International War.* What I have already said above, in distinguishing the exercise of killing force by police from the exercise of killing force by soldiers, indicates that when the restraints of love and knowledge are removed (as they are not removed in the case of the doctor) or when the restraints of law, reason, and consent are removed (as they are not removed in the case of the police power) my religious experience and values—love, truth, goodness, beauty—will not permit me to exercise killing physical force. But even when such restraints are not removed there is much hesitancy on my part to say that I could exercise killing physical force. My religious training and experience leave me with the deep conviction that because of the fallibility of man's knowledge, the impurity of man's laws, and the imperfections in our techniques for securing the genuine consent of an enlightened substantial majority, the matter of life and death would better be left with God.

In general it seems that the following principle compels my belief. Force should never be used to the extent that the user of the force is unable to restore the rights, privileges, and functions that may be destroyed by it. The state can promote life and condition life. But it has not the power to give life. Accordingly, in my religious belief, the state would not be permitted to take life, and its uniform does not absolve me from the sin of murder. Scruples against capital punishment or euthanasia well up into a positively clear conscience against studied, skilled, indiscriminate mass killing—which is war.

This, then, is the way the use of force appears to me. I may be mistaken. Surely it behooves one who claims deferment from military service on conscientious grounds to be conscientious respecting the consciences of others. I could not, accordingly, sabotage the efforts of those who conscientiously train for and engage in mass killing.

But I should be willing to take my chances, and do trust the lives and possessions and liberties of those I love, in a society where a lethal instrument is never turned by man upon man. Those who submit to military training, as well as COs, may very likely agree. There would be no risk involved in such a society; but the present world is full, we are told, of gangsters, desperadoes, and international brigands. The difference is that the conscientious objector, since he cannot expect others to go to war in his behalf, must be ready to take such chances not only in such a utopian society, but in the world as it is today, Hitler and all. He is ready to do so in the confidence that in this and other constructive ways, he is hastening the day when all force shall be brought under the restraint of law.

I believe that the world situation today is essentially that which I have described under the heading of civil war. The situation calls not for continued mass killing, but for the immediate organization of a world constitution, as the first step in the checking of violence. I say "violence," instead of "aggression," because as between those nations which engage in the use of planned killing force, I am unable to distinguish aggressor from non-aggressor. The nations which take the lead in proposals of fundamental principles for a world government should have first right to the title of non-aggressors. The important thing, as the Quakers say, is not to curse the darkness, but to light a candle. Individuals and groups should try to live in such a way as to take away the occasions for physical force. In general I believe that as one lives according to the truest religious experience, one finds few occasions for the use of any force other than persuasion and spiritual inspiration.

# Problems of Relocation

By JOSEPH B. HUNTER*

MORE than two years ago thousands of United States citizens of Japanese descent living in Pacific Coast areas were placed in concentration camps and later transferred to "relocation centers." Most Americans are still uninformed as to the character of these people, the real reasons for their confinement, and the Government's plan of resettlement.

There are some basic facts that every citizen ought to know. All should know that there are approximately 110,000 of these people, three-fourths of them United States citizens because they were born in this country, and that most of their parents would be citizens now if our naturalization laws had not prevented Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos from obtaining this prize. All should know that these young citizens have been zealous students in our public schools and have become Americanized to an amazing degree; that their record as to law obedience, keeping their people off relief, and generosity in supporting community chests is not surpassed by any group in our country; and that they were not guilty of sabotage. All should know that the Japanese people in Hawaii were not asked to leave their homes and that the 110,000 were pushed out of our Pacific Coast states mainly by politicians, competing truck growers and merchants, race-baiting newspapers, and a public made hysterical by false stories repeated deliberately to create mistrust. The historical record will always remind us, to our shame, that we permitted all these un-American activities while fighting a war to secure just treatment for oppressed groups throughout the world.

The Army established ten relocation centers and transferred the evacuees to them from concentration camps which it chose to call "assembly centers." This transfer was made in the fall of 1942. By April, 1943, the movement to resettle these people in normal living conditions was well under way. Those asking to be repatriated to Japan and those who would not swear allegiance to the United States were segregated in a camp at Tule Lake, California. From the other nine centers a steady stream of people, mostly young people, have been released to reestablish themselves in the outside world. Nearly six hundred, besides those going into the Army, left one center during the month of July. They are working as farmers, domestic servants, accountants, hospital surgeons, dental technicians, stenographers, pharmacists and workers in defense plants. In this way some 30,000 have returned to normal life. Their reception by the public has been very good indeed. The few exceptions have been due to ignorance, politics, utter selfishness, and sensation-hungry newspapers.

The United States Government permitted this un-American and discriminate uprooting, but its conscience did not entirely cease to function. It created the War Relocation Authority for the purpose of restoring justice to these people as rapidly as possible. This agency has done a creditable job, considering the many handicaps it has faced. It has had to work against a public made bitter by official war propaganda, and against predatory interests bent on destroying this minority group and apparently only slightly concerned about national defense. They are still yelping even though all charges of sabotage have been disproved, the danger of invasion is past, and these people are contributing their share of citizen sons to the fighting forces in Italy and on Saipan.

There are some almost unbelievable phases of the discrimination to which these people are being subjected. I want to take excerpts from a statement recently prepared by one of the project attorneys:

"In 1920 California passed what was commonly called the Alien Land Law, which prohibits aliens not eligible for naturalization from owning agricultural lands.

"Problems come to the project attorney's office regarding the disposition of the properties of American soldiers of Japanese descent should they be killed in action. If their parents should be their only heirs, the property would escheat to the state of California, according to California Law. Even the War Risk Insurance would pass to the state of California, unless the United States Government has a right to disregard California State Law.

"A certain soldier has a lemon grove. His only heir is his mother. If he is killed, the mother will have neither a son nor a lemon grove. The grove will be sold and she will have whatever money the orchard brings at a public sale. It seems unfair that alien parents whose sons die in service should pay this double price as their contribution to the war effort. Of course, the WRA has no jurisdiction over what the state law should be in California. The Federal Government, however, does have jurisdiction as to who can become an American citizen. Would it not be appropriate for Congress to amend the Naturalization Law so that a Japanese alien who has resided twenty years in America and has a son in the United States Army could immediately be eligible for citizenship? Could anybody deny to any parent of a fighting soldier the right to be a citizen? If any state should oppose such an amendment to the Naturalization Law, it would be most unreasonable. Such an amendment would relieve the minds of many inductees from relocation centers; it would give them hope and reward their parents for contributing sons to the cause of justice. It certainly would help the boys who are destroying German fortifications in Italy to know that their parents would have the privilege of obtaining citizenship in the nation for which they are willing to give their sons."

These young United States soldiers of Japanese descent have won the admiration of their officers, comrades, and as many ordinary citizens as have kept up with the record. The 100th Battalion has been cited twice for distinguished service in Italy. Six of our soldiers of Japanese descent were among those receiving medals and high praise for their valor in the conquest of Saipan. Such reports are causing our people all across the country to offer jobs and hospitality to the families of these fighting men.

Some families in relocation centers feel unable to relocate. In some cases the father and breadwinner is in the Army. Those who are farmers cannot re-establish

*An FOR member, now Assistant Project Director at Rohwer Relocation Center, McGehee, Arkansas.

themselves as easily as those who go to work in factories and are paid each week. A major problem is the scarcity of houses. Truck farmers feel obliged to relocate in groups large enough to grow a sufficient quantity of vegetables to justify a jobber in purchasing the entire crop before it is harvested. Many of the older people speak English very poorly and feel obliged to relocate where there can be free association with those who speak their language.

There is still a good deal of fear in the hearts of many evacuees who remain within relocation centers. They were threatened with violence at the time of evacuation. They do not know that these threats were made by a very small but aggressive minority.

In spite of all this, the outlook is hopeful. American people are gradually learning the truth about the evacuation, relocation, and the service of these young men in the war. The fine record which these people have made in America is being recited from Christian pulpits and in religous journals all across our land. Young people with education and retaining an inheritance of oriental culture are making friends in all parts of America and are thus preparing our people to live in "one world" in fellowship with all the children of God.

# Blockade of Hate

By ENRICO C. S. MOLNÁR*

EVERY additional day of our war adds thousands of people to the unwritten list of those who are condemned to a slow death in installments because of lack of food. And every additional day of this same war adds thousands of people to a host of those whose consciences are dulled and whose reason is silenced in the onrushing stream of mounting passions and bitterness.

The Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, California, inaugurated a year ago the first church-sponsored school of "Training for Post-War Rehabilitation Abroad." I enlisted together with some thirty other young men and women from all over the country and was offered the privilege of teaching German to that group of students who intend to go and help in the reconstruction of Central Europe. And here happened something which caused me to think and question several problems.

When a Czech friend of mine heard that I, also a Czech, "fell down so low" as to teach German, the language of "our worst hereditary enemy," he immediately severed all connections with me. He would have nothing to do with a "traitor of our sacred cause."

A few days earlier the newspapers had carried an interview of a correspondent with Monsignor Sramek, the prime minister of the Czecho-Slovak refugee government in London. He was asked whether his government would be willing to have the blockade lifted in such a way that food might be sent to the starving Czech and Slovak children, as was done—rather successfully—in Greece. And the prime minister, a professional high ranking *Christian* leader, answered by saying that, at this time, it is our Christian duty to sacrifice the lives of even thousands of children in order to achieve our goal.

When one country blockades another country, it may be explained in terms of revenge and of hatred. But if an exiled government supports the blockade of its own people, this may not be explained away by any conceivable human reasoning. This criminal attitude is one of the reasons why the peoples of Yugoslavia and Greece refuse to regard the refugee governments in London or Cairo as their legitimate representatives. And who blames them? Raymond Gram Swing suggested in a recent broadcast that many other exiled governments will find themselves in a similarly difficult situation.

As one looks at Europe of today it is criminal to think feudally in terms of frontiers and favored nations. Europe is one continent, and the problem of one nation must be the concern of all nations. There never was a beautiful isolated Shangri-La except in literature. We must not lose our horizons in wishful thinking. But the kingdom of God is a reality which embraces everything, regardless of whether there is, on the reverse, a stamp with the inscription, "Made in Germany," "Made in Czecho-Slovakia" or "Made in the Soviet Union."

"A new commandment I give you, that you love one another; that as I have loved you, you also love one another. By this will all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another."

"For if you love only those who love you, what reward can you expect? Do not the very tax-collectors do that?" And if you are polite to your brothers and no one else, what is there remarkable in that? Do not the very heathen and the refugee governments do that?

I know it is easy to hate. I found that out when I received the news of my father's execution. But if the wind of circumstance should by its whim change one's attitude, what would the Christian faith and conscience be worth? Our Christian faith should be the abiding experience in the midst of changing categories.

Dr. Frank Munk, also from Prague, author of *Economics of Force* and other books, gave us a few lectures on the conditions in Central Europe. I remember particularly the statement he made at the opening meeting: "Because of the blockade there are many people in Czecho-Slovakia who would be dead by now. But there is one thing that keeps them alive: intense hatred." They wait for the day when the scales of fortune will change and when they may add their two bits' worth of exquisite torments to their present-day oppressors. The lamp posts of Prague will not suffice for the Germans whom they have in mind. So burn these fires of hate.

It is truth, tragic truth. But precisely because of that it is a challenge, an imperative challenge for us who profess to be Christians.

*Former Secretary of the FOR in Czecho-Slovakia, now teaching languages in the Pacific School of Religion. This material reprinted by permission from *The Moravian*.

What about the organizational development of the FOR and the peace movement? Some suggestions about—

# The Direction of Growth

By A. J. MUSTE

A FEW MONTHS ago I wrote an article for FELLOWSHIP on "Pacifism After the War" which was later issued also in pamphlet form. It dealt mainly with some of the fields in which it seemed to me we would have to work out a program based on religious pacifism, and made some suggestions for such a program—economic, social, and political. The question of the organizational development of the FOR in particular and of the pacifist movement generally has repeatedly come to the front in recent discussions. It seems appropriate and even essential that something should be said about this problem in the issue of FELLOWSHIP which appears on the eve of our fall General Conferences. What follows is, however, in no sense an official pronouncement, but simply an attempt to express some of my own thoughts as a possible contribution to a discussion to which many contributions, individual and corporate, will need to be made.

Until a few years ago, the Fellowship was a very loose organization. Members belonged to the national organization but not many of them functioned with any regularity in local groups. In some cases members living in the same locality did not know each other, yet they felt a considerable sense of loyalty to FOR, and membership meant a great deal to them. And, especially in the churches, these people exercised no small influence as individuals. Through its literature and its speakers the Fellowship made a major contribution to the growth of Christian pacifist influence in the churches.

In recent years there has been growth and intensified activity both locally and nationally. Thus, on the one hand, a process of decentralization has taken place. Regional offices have been opened and regional committees tend to take on greater responsibilities and to regard their work as significant. State organizations have grown up. Most of all in local communities the members have been drawn closer together and have engaged in more corporate activity. The decentralization has not meant, however, less activity growing out of and centering in the national office, but rather more. In part this has consisted of more of the same kind of thing we had been doing in the publication of literature, for example. In part it has meant branching into new fields such as interracial and high school age work and experiments in non-violent direct action. It may be fairly stated also that this increase in "outward" activity has not been at the cost of concern about the inner life but rather has grown largely out of deepened spiritual life.

The fact that the Fellowship has in these recent years grown in numbers and has been able without undue strain to finance its increased activities may be regarded up to a point as evidence that it has been meeting a need and that its program has been sound. On the other hand, we must weigh the fact that the war served to drive us together. The problems of a post-war period will be more complicated and the forces at work in it are likely to be centrifugal. Furthermore, what may have been accomplished is so small in comparison with the awful need that no one can be even momentarily complacent.

What of the future development of FOR? It is conceivable that it might go on for some time being much the same kind of organization with much the same program and organizational form it now has. The composition of its membership would vary greatly, with some just beginning in the pacifist way of life and perhaps not yet very deeply committed, and others fully committed and grown to maturity. It would engage in a number of activities and projects but it would not become a "movement" with a coherent and fairly specific program. Its members would devote most of their time to other organizations and movements. Its main task would be to win individuals to an acceptance of a religious pacifist viewpoint, provide them with a measure of fellowship, and educate them up to a certain level. Those who developed a more intense and specific concern would move on into, or build, other organizations, sometimes formally leaving and sometimes remaining in FOR. It is possible that there would be a long and useful future for such an organization. Certainly much of the work I have suggested for it will have to be done by some organization.

There are good grounds, however, for raising the question whether this can or should be our course in the years ahead. There are already pressures from various directions to adopt or emphasize certain objectives. We live and shall live in a period of rapid change, and the organization that remains static is in danger of becoming futile. But far more important than any such considerations as these is the fact that the Fellowship and its members have committed themselves to a far greater and more basic task than we have yet undertaken in action or even formulated into a concrete program.

We profess—see our Statement of Purpose—to be people who believe that *"love* such as seen preëminently in Jesus, must serve as the true guide of personal conduct *under all circumstances,"* people who "desire to follow *unswervingly* the way of life exemplified by Jesus" or other prophets of love. True to the Hebrew-Christian prophetism which is our source—much more so, incidentally, than is the nineteenth- or early twentieth-century liberalism against which Niebuhr tilts so valiantly—we believe that the same love is the guide for the conduct of society—"the effective *force* for *overcoming evil* and *transforming society* into a creative fellowship." Again, we "strive to *build a social order* which will suffer no individual or group to be exploited." The phrase "revolutionary Christian, or religious, pacifism" is often used, sometimes of ideas I do not accept; but, rightly understood, that is exactly what the FOR is committed to, at least on paper.

Furthermore, we solemnly profess that we can have, if we want them, the wisdom and strength required to carry out this task. "Far beyond the limits of our present experience," they are "available to all who open their lives to the leading of the Spirit of God."

Undoubtedly, except for occasional moments of mountain-top experience, few of us have grasped the significance of these professions or striven consistently to carry out whatever we have interpreted them to mean. This is serious; but it is not fatal to the organization. Rather it is natural that we should grow slowly into a realization of what we have undertaken. But to retain our Statement of Purpose and not to grow in our realization of its meaning and in our commitment to it—to retain it, but in spirit and practice to repudiate it—this would be fatal, since it would be a "sin against the Holy Spirit."

We shall have to move forward or cease to be, and the question of the nature and direction of this movement is crucial.

The forward movement will be in the right direction, can indeed occur at all, only as the result of a spiritual revival in the Fellowship. This is so because of the nature of pacifism itself and because of the basic need of our age.

In a revolutionary period—and it is obvious that we are living in that kind of period—the problem is that of reconstituting life as a whole, developing an "order" again. The task cannot be approached effectively, therefore, on a one-track or panacea basis—not even that of abolishing war. It is not a question of this or that economic or political reform. A way of life, a whole culture, is falling to pieces, and life has to be reordered as a whole.

But a beginning has to be made somewhere, and a true beginning in such a situation must be a *religious* revival or revolution. For one thing, in such a situation a new vision is needed. Secondly, the new way of life can operate and be made effective only through people who have effected a new contact with the sources of all life. "We must go back to the deep sources." It is people who are not disillusioned and frustrated (as are the masses today) who must build the new order—people who feel the pulse of life in them again and are therefore dynamic.

Again, we have to begin with spiritual revival because before there can be a genuinely new program—not a retinkered old one—there must be a method by which men find out what the new program is to be, a method by which a program is tested.

All this points straight to the pacifist cell or team, it seems to me, as the main line of development in the period ahead. History attests that it is upon such groups that the Holy Spirit descends—in them that the vision is born, power generated, and a working program hammered out by the combined process of reflection, worship, and experimentation in constant humble dependence upon God. Another way to state the matter would be to say that action-oriented worship and worship-centered action are the "genius" and essence of the Fellowship. The cell-program is not one of retreat from the world. Our mission is to "build a social order," to "overcome evil and transform society into a creative fellowship."

This means that problems of social or political action cannot be evaded. In the past many have experimented with this task of a religious group engaging in social action, working to build the Kingdom of God on earth. No one has worked out a magic formula. But making the attempt is the unceasing task of those who are nurtured in Hebrew-Christian prophetism. One effort to grapple with it will be made at an FOR Study Conference in September, authorized by the National Council.

One or two more observations of a preliminary character should be made now. From time to time the idea is advanced that we should have an "over-all pacifist organization" presumably concentrating on opposing and abolishing war and "the war system." It may be that the desirability of such an organization will become clear and that it will come into being one day; but at present I have the gravest doubts. The example of the Peace Pledge Union in Great Britain, with its drastic drop in membership since 1939, does not seem to me to warrant optimism on this score. Often the proponents of this type of organization seem to me to underestimate the role of religious vision, commitment, and dynamic. There is too much dependence on mere human resources. Beyond a certain point, war and the war-system cannot be dealt with in isolation from the entire economic, political, cultural set-up.

As soon as such an organization gets under way, it will have to face the question whether or not it is to become a political party. If not, through what other party will it work? And if there is a party in which it can work hopefully, why an existence separate from it? On the other hand, if it is to become a political party, it will have to be either essentially reformist and parliamentary, or revolutionary. If the former, how is such a party to be built in this country? Why do people think pacifists would succeed where laborites and socialists fail? On what ground do they believe that such a party would avoid the fate that has overcome social-democratic and labor parties hitherto?

If the pacifist over-all organization sets out to be "revolutionary," how will it improve upon other essentially secular revolutionary parties? I am personally convinced that the world does not need any more secular revolutionary factions, which is all I think pacifists undertaking that kind of job would produce. *The world does need political action which grows out of a religious dynamic and which is based on good news about a divine order of life.*

This points, as I have said, to the religious pacifist cell approach. Unquestionably some will attempt this, because they feel a divine call to do so. It is to them we must look for the new order that must come to birth. The embodiment that emerges may seem to have no economic or political influence; people may say that it is unrealistic and utopian. It is pretty certain to be a "little flock"—but one to which it is the Father's good pleasure to give the Kingdom.

How little? There is in this country, I believe, no matrix in which such a movement is more likely to grow than FOR. Perhaps it is FOR's role to help bring it to birth and then let it go on its way. But, as I have said, our Statement of Purpose suggests that FOR itself ought to become such a revolutionary religious pacifist force, and that all of us who have signed that statement ought to become committed and disciplined members of such a movement standing for action-oriented worship and worship-centered action. Why not?

## *News from the Peace Front*

# Protest Against Robots Issued by 28 FOR Members

A protest against the Nazis' use of robot bombs was issued and signed on July 30 by the same 28 prominent FOR members who signed the foreword to Vera Brittain's "Massacre by Bombing" last March. Releases from FOR headquarters were published in the *New York Times,* the *Herald Tribune,* various weekly publications, and were sent throughout the nation by Associated Press and Religious News Service. The statement, after protesting the bombing, went on to say:

"Our appeal in both cases is made from the standpoint of that humanity and religion which is above all nations. We believe it is the truth that humanity is a single family, created by one God. This fact binds us so that neither national boundaries nor racial ideologies can set aside the inter-relationship whereby the whole body suffers if any of its parts are harmed. We plead especially for the adoption of measures by all governments that would lessen the mass slaughter of children, women and youth. Let us not dim the hope of future peace by deeds in the closing period of the war that will add to the load of hatred that our generation carries."

It is not known whether the statement has actually reached Germany, but it was cabled to Siegmund Schultze in Switzerland and he replied that he would undertake to secure as wide publicity as possible on the Continent. It was also printed in British papers.

Vera Brittain, in a recent letter, declares that reaction to this robot attack is not nearly as strong as that against the blitz of 1940-41, probably because the people realize that it has been brought on partly by the Government's callous and insistent policy of obliteration bombing of German cities. However, London newspapers are reporting a popular demand for revenge. One clergyman is said to have asked that a German town be destroyed for every robot bomb that falls in England.

## Peacetime Conscription Campaign Under Way

Forces favoring a system of compulsory military training after the war are planning a strong campaign for the coming months. Indeed, it is already under way. A newly formed Citizens' Committee for Universal Service is spreading propaganda urging the support of the Gurney-Wadsworth Bill and the May Bill, both of which provide for one year of compulsory military training for youths 17 or 18 years of age, plus four to eight years of reserve training later if the Government so desires.

President Roosevelt and Dewey both favor such a system of peacetime conscription, and Mrs. Roosevelt has declared that if we have it, "it should be for boys and girls and it should provide training in citizenship responsibility." However, in the same speech Mrs. Roosevelt emphasized goals that could far better be attained through our schools and colleges than through a military system, such as education in practical self-government, community service, and improved medical and dental care.

Anti-conscription forces are going to have to work hard to defeat this campaign for permanent militarization of the nation. One thing that FOR members can do is to order copies of the leaflet "Should the United States Adopt Permanent Military Conscription?" and distribute them as widely as possible. It contains statements by religious and educational groups against conscription. Another leaflet that should get wide circulation is "Peacetime Conscription" prepared by the Friends Service Committee, an excellent question-and-answer treatment of the subject. (See back cover for prices.) And everyone can continue to write letters to newspaper editors and Congressmen.

## 8641 Parole Plan A Disappointment

Recent reports from those who are familiar with the facts indicate that Selective Service is not living up to its promises in connection with the new 8641 parole plan. When the plan was first announced, Gen. Hershey declared that there was now "no reason why any conscientious objector should not be released from prison to worthwhile service," and "it would be difficult to conceive a more liberal parole policy for COs."

But the responsible officials seem to be using every possible excuse to avoid putting that policy into effect. A great many imprisoned COs have refused to apply for parole under the new plan because they consider the restrictions too severe, and only a small proportion of those who have applied have been granted parole. The experience of one imprisoned CO will illustrate some of the obstacles involved.

This particular CO went to his draft board and asked for a 4E when he quit his job in a defense plant because he had made up his mind he could no longer aid the war effort. The board decided his objections were not "religious." He was imprisoned after an appeal to the President was denied. Shortly after beginning his two-year term he applied for parole under 8641, for which he was eligible after serving 60 days. After six months he was advised he would be considered under Revised 8641 if he would make a new application, which he did. The prison draft board reviewed his record and decided that under the Kauten-Phillips decision he was a genuine CO, and granted him 4E, making him eligible for parole. He signed up for plan 4, similar to CPS detached service. He was then given a physical exam and received 4F. Selective Service had promised that 4Es who signed for service and then made 4F would be granted liberal paroles, so the way seemed clear. A job was secured for him in a hospital, and the prison draft board sent his papers to Washington with recommendation for parole. After more waiting, a letter arrived from Washington announcing that he was not a likely prospect for parole because he had "assumed his conscientious objection at too convenient a date" and that in any case his parole would have to be held up a couple of months so "that a greater portion of his sentence might be served." (He had served 9 months of his two-year term!)

The parole plan was ostensibly inaugurated to transfer as many COs as possibe from the waste of prison to some needed form of community service. Apparently the authorities now do not want it to work that way. The men who apply and then are turned down for no good reason are bitterly disappointed, not only in the Washington officials but also in NSBRO and the churches and other groups that continue to cooperate with them and to accept their excuses and evasions. FOR members are urged to write Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, and Mr. James V. Bennett, Director Federal Bureau of Prisons, both in Washington, D. C., and protest their failure to live up to the spirit of Executive Order 8641.

## Food for Europe

FELLOWSHIP's June back cover succeeded in persuading many persons to send packages of food to the starving children of Europe in care of Churchill, Halifax and Roosevelt, along with notes urging the United States and British governments to find some way to get this food into occupied countries.

Since then the editors have received letters from some, asking whether the program of mailing food packages should be continued any longer, in view of changed conditions resulting from the invasion of France. It has been difficult to get authoritative information about this, but now it appears that there is no hope of accomplishing anything by civilian efforts.

Dr. Howard E. Kershner, chairman of the Temporary Council on Food for Europe's Children, recently expressed the belief that the Army will do its best to feed the needy people of the occupied areas as fast as they are liberated, and that it will profit by its mistakes in Italy and do a much better job in France.

## British FOR Works for Christian Peace

The British FOR has undertaken an intensive campaign "Towards a Christian Peace," calling upon all men of good will to press for these essential steps:

1. The construction of peace terms on a basis not of retribution and punishment but rather of common needs, common sufferings and common obligations.

2. The creation of a world society to which all men shall owe loyalty, and the subordination of national sovereignty to the requirements of such a world society.

3. The acceptance by all nations, victors as well as vanquished, of progressive measures towards total disarmament.

4. The assurance of freedom of religious life, of speech, and of assembly.

5. Sustained action by means of definite steps to be taken within a specified time, to prevent victimization of subject races, to end imperialism, and to bring all peoples to a position of freedom within the world community.

6. The sharing of the natural resources of the world through common ownership or adequate control in the interests of all.

7. The encouragement of the sense of vocation; the realization that all members of the community are called to its service in peace no less than in war; the willing acceptance of necessary regulations for the good of all, but the rejection of those regulations and compulsions which frustrate vocation, and especially of any conscription for military purposes.

8. The recognition that all men have the right to work, and the provision of the essential means, material and cultural, for the fulfilment and enrichment of their lives.

The campaign calls for carefully organized and sustained effort to reach as large a constituency as possible with this message and to influence national and international policies accordingly.

## Prison Strike

John Griffith, Robert Swink, and William Holderith, COs imprisoned at the Federal Reformatory, Petersburg, Virginia, began a work strike on June 12, giving as their reasons for non-cooperation (1) the fact that prison is used as an instrument to help enforce conscription and aid the war effort, (2) their belief that prisons are crude and ineffective and that they inflict barbarous and needless suffering, and (3) their conviction that they must resist to the utmost the demand of the state for complete control over the life of the individual.

It is reported that the men were placed in solitary confinement almost immediately. After more than two weeks of solitary confinement and "isolation," a modified form of the former, Swink decided to return to work, but at last report both Griffith and Holderith were still in isolation. It would help if friends of these men would write James V. Bennett, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, making known their concern and urging him to permit some minister or other competent counselor who understands COs to visit the prison and confer with these men and with the prison officials.

## Jottings

The NCCO is preparing a list of COs in prison who will be coming up for parole during the next few months. FOR members are urged to write to their group leaders for copies of the list of men from their localities, and then write the parole board letters of recommendation about any of the men they happen to know. Local FOR groups or peace teams might also write (as groups), and persuade prominent local non-pacifists to write such letters urging the parole of the eligible COs.

* * *

In the June 30 issue of *Peace News* a short item pointed out the great contrast that existed between the surrender terms given the Germans at Cherbourg and those offered the German nation as a whole. "Not merely were the German soldiers assured of humane treatment; not merely told that they would be allowed to write home 7 times a month, and cared for as well as they were cared for in the German Army, but they were actually invited to preserve themselves from futile destruction in order to reconstruct Germany. If only the political authorities could speak to the German nation with the same accents as the military authorities speak to the German soldiers!"

* * *

George Houser, FOR Action Projects Secretary, needs a part-time or full-time worker in the office. Write him at 7100 Kinsman Road, Cleveland 4, Ohio.

* * *

The Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California, is offering a comprehensive course in training for post-war rehabilitation abroad, beginning September 25. Inquire of Dr. Frank C. Foster, 1798 Scenic Avenue, Berkeley 4, Calif.

* * *

Changes of address for FELLOWSHIP subscriptions should be mailed to the Membership Secretary, FOR, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y., in order to avoid delays. Do not forget to include your postal zone number.

### READ THIS AT YOUR OWN RISK!

Fellowship members who expect to contribute to the 1944 budget (and haven't already crashed through) are hereby notified and reminded that the year is beginning to slide downhill, all in a heap. Consequently, any impulse to put a check or money order in the mailbox should get the green light—a big green light. It is expensive and a time-consuming chore to keep writing letters (even third class letters) with pert paragraphs saying, "Please pony up. Please dob in. Please remit. Please send the dinero," and everybody knows right well there are dozens of far more urgent things for the staff at 2929 to be doing. Which explains this brief appeal; not gaudy but urgent. *Real* urgent.

Those who dropped theirs in when the hat was passed earlier in the year are welcome to search their souls—and pockets—to see if time has done nobly by them. Who knows—they too may now be able to spare another dime!

Two job openings have been called to our attention as possibilites for COs on detached service or paroled COs. One is work as a printer for a weekly newspaper, and the other demands someone willing to work as church janitor and at the same time work on a program to combat juvenile delinquency. Write the editors for further information.

* * *

Word has just been received that Roger Axford, former Midwest Secretary of FOR, imprisoned in June for refusing assignment to CPS, has protested against racial segregation in the Federal Correctional Institution, Milan, Michigan, and as a result has been held in solitary confinement for more than a month.

* * *

A committee has been formed to organize a CPS union. A tentative statement of objectives and methods has been prepared and may be secured from the new Secretary, Milton Gold, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston 4, Mass.

* * *

Sky Valley Farm, a pacifist community, near Zirconia, N. C., is desperately in need of a second car or station wagon and would appreciate hearing from anyone who has a suggestion. Write Mrs. J. Y. Perry.

**FOR Field Secretaries**

*South:* Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville 4, Tenn.; *Midwest:* Emerson Schwenk, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.; *Northern California:* Caleb Foote, 2151 Vine Street, Berkeley 7, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, 1837 N. Berendo Street, Los Angeles 27, Cal.; *Rocky Mountain:* Margaret Rohrer, 1418 Grape Street, Denver, Colo.; *Rural:* Warren Nelson, Prairie du Sac, Wis.; *Refugee:* Marion Frenyear, 45 Astor Place, New York 3, N. Y.; *Action Projects:* George Houser, 7100 Kinsman Rd., Cleveland, Ohio.

# The Peacemaker's Bookshelf

## Realistic Pacifism

*Peace Is the Victory.* A symposium by Devere Allen, Harrop A. Freeman, Harry Emerson Fosdick, John Haynes Holmes, E. Stanley Jones, Hiram Motherwell, A. J. Muste, Kirby Page, Albert W. Palmer, Theodore Paullin, Clarence E. Pickett, Robert Stevens, and Oswald Garrison Villard. Harper & Bros., 1944. 253 pages. $1.50.

Were this book the sole product of the Pacifist Research Bureau in its first year of existence, it would vindicate the faith of those who worked for its establishment. *Peace Is the Victory* has been carefully edited by Harrop A. Freeman, director of the Bureau, who has succeeded in welding the thirteen separate contributions into a unified and integrated whole. Throughout the book appears the common dedication of the writers to the proposition so forcefully phrased by Victor Hugo: "There is something greater than armies, and that is an idea when its time has come."

It is refreshing in this authoritarian age to find the thoughts of such a noted group of men presented with a frank recognition of the difficulties involved in charting the structure of peace. As Harrop Freeman remarks in his preface: "The writers of this book are aware of their inability to comprehend or present within its limits all the problems which must be faced. . . . The important consideration is not that each one be able to see or comprehend the whole, but it does matter whether each one reports truthfully what he feels and knows." The writers have not failed their trust.

Here is no apology for Christian pacifism. Rather we find a clear review of the limitations of war as an instrument of international policy and a restrained but stimulating and challenging presentation of the principles of love in the philosophy of Jesus as an alternative deserving the honest consideration of mankind. The approach is sane, practical, and realistic. It will be hard to pass off this book as "simpering idealism," "pious mouthings," "impractical theorizing." It is too factual, too sane, too logical to sustain these common charges.

In this book are many striking ideas forcefully presented. Albert Palmer's concept of World War II as civil strife between people who ought to live together in community because they have large areas of cultural life in common has vast import for the peacemaker. Those whom we now fight will not disappear when armed conflict ceases but will continue with us as citizens of a world community with whom we must do business and live in closer and closer relationship. There is abundant food for thought in A. J. Muste's insistence that the supreme question in the culmination period in which we live is whether the Judaeo-Christian civilization can accomplish its historic mission. There is international statesmanship in Hiram Motherwell's discussion of reconstruction without military coercion, in Theodore Paullin's advocacy of functional world organization as distinguished from constitutional political leagues, and in Stanley Jones' demand that a "welfare economy" be substituted for the current "power economy."

The reader of *Peace Is the Victory* will find within its pages a quiet assurance—supported by much evidence—that in the inter-relations of men and nations the way of love will ultimately hold sway, for it is written into the constitution of the universe.

WALTER W. VAN KIRK

## Religion and War

*Say Yes to the Light.* By Allan A. Hunter. Harper & Brothers. 1944. 150 pp. $1.50.

A man's attitude towards war is a clue to his religion, for ultimately his faith is that hypothesis upon which he bases his daily life, and on which in times of crisis he places reliance. The minister of the Mount Hollywood Congregational Church of Los Angeles says there are three different levels on which one may think concerning this greatest social expression of man's egoism. *First,* that we are here to eat, drink and be merry, so why bother to defend a way of life, or to protect the oppressed or threatened? *Second,* that war force is ordained of God, who is so weak that he may perish unless the biggest battalions defend his existence and sovereignty; and the wicked must be met in righteous wrath with a superior force of arms, else our grandchildren will be unable either to love or to believe in love. *Third,* that God is so infinitely powerful and merciful that, far from being careless about justice, he is seeking to establish it by the coercion of the cross. Such faith is not dependent upon an ability "to get there fastest with the mostest," nor does it subordinate all things to the clay-footed idol Victory, which those on the second level regard as the Absolute. Rather, war is an illustration of the sin of the world which God is seeking to redeem. For a Christian to renounce the means whereby redemption is to be effected is high treason.

The level on which a person thinks with regard to war is dependent upon the light by which he lives. This is a figure that is carried through the entire book. Each person must have his own secret stairway by which he approaches the light, a stairway based not on ecclesiastical or national approvals, but upon inner disciplines. A suggested set of procedures whereby one seeks to discover the light for himself is as follows: First, to agree in advance that one will attempt to do the will of God when it is revealed. Second, to make one's conscience alert and informed. Third, to bring the facts into the presence of God and leave them there. Fourth, to wait, certain that the answer will make itself known in due time. Advocates who live on the second level, and claim that no such formula is available to people who live in a warring world, illustrate our dilemma as that of passengers aboard an ocean liner, already hundreds of miles at sea, who suddenly discover themselves embarked on an enterprise in which we no longer believe, but whose only reasonable choice now is to keep on until the engagement is concluded. The writer pronounces this dilemma as false, because it rules out the power of God to repeat his performance at Golgotha, namely, so to alter the situation that, despite the wrong which has gone before, good may have precedence. While the alternative action would differ according to the individual, each would be possessed of a new dynamic and a new dimension. One might resign his post and accept the consequences. Another would perform his duties for the remainder of the voyage, but commit himself to a different course of action, which commitment would manifest itself at least from the time the voyage terminated.

Just as forgiveness is the essence of God's mighty creativity in the crucifixion, just so is it central in breaking the vicious circle of our past sins which now compel us to drop this bomb on Tokyo saying, "God, I'm sorry, but there is no other way." Forgiveness brings the past and present into a new creative relationship, so that, through the one who forgives, a new creative force is released into the world. Forgiveness does not erase the consequences of prior evil, but it does reverse the darkness of the human will.

The wounds of the world are gangrening. Only the reconciling, restorative power of God in men practicing forgiveness on a large scale will make it whole. The power to be a channel of forgiveness is what we encounter supremely in Jesus. The world is waiting to encounter it in his followers. If we let the grace of forgiveness pour through us, we may have to give up not only all we possess but all we have yet become. The redemptive process demands nothing less than such complete abandonment of self.

This devotional manual will take its place on the shelf alongside St. Augustine's *Confessions,* Kelly's *Testament of Devotion,* and Geren's *Burma Diary.* While difficult at points to follow, especially in his transitions, the book shows the relationship of the practice of the presence of God to man's greatest social problem of the present century, the elimination of war. While the author has not stated the final word on the subject, when and if it is given us, that word will reflect *Say Yes to the Light.*

WINBURN T. THOMAS

# Pro and Con

## A PAGE OF COMMENT BY READERS

**Readers are invited to contribute to this page. Please keep letters brief, since space is severely limited.**

### Tackling Jim Crow

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

I have been happy to be in FOR for the very reason that it is not merely an anti-war organization, but espouses constructive reform on many fronts. But the Houser episode is disillusioning. If his efforts represent the deliberate policy of the leaders in FOR, I shall feel very much alone.

I am wholly in sympathy with his primary aim; I am wholly opposed to the methods by which he sought to realize it. Such methods will inflict deserved disrepute upon FOR. If an attempt were made to practice them widely, it would doom the attainment of social equality.

Without mutual good feeling social equality is non-existent. Houser's method destroys good feeling, and in its place produces hatred. Hence I would say that the experiment was futile, foolhardy, and highly undesirable.

There are many lines of effort that should be undertaken in the churches at all age levels. Many persons regard the church as the stronghold of Jim Crowism in this country. If this is true, what can we expect of a poor skating rink proprietor? Judgment should begin at the house of God. It is beyond all reason to expect the world to practice a higher morality than the church practices.

But I would by no means limit my efforts to the church; we have a wide field in which to work. In seeking social equality elsewhere, I would seek it at points where it would have meaning and value. I would seek to attain real social equality, and not merely equal rights to use the same facilities under the protection of the law.

If Mr. Houser believes that some special value pertains to equal skating rink privileges, the thing for him to do is to establish a new rink that would be open to all who wished to use it.

A. J. R. SCHUMAKER

---

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

My congratulations to FELLOWSHIP and to George Houser for the article, "Tackling Jim Crow is a Dangerous Job," in your August issue. All of us, especially those who have plenty of good will but little experience in interracial situations, need to be reminded there is genuine danger in challenging race prejudice.

May I make a suggestion which Mr. Houser and others may or may not find useful? Oklahoma is, of course, a Southern state with moderate Jim Crow laws and customs. We have here in Tulsa a youth council made up of delegates from all local churches who wish to send them, colored as well as white. Simply by existing and by practicing fellowship within the council, we influence the attitudes of the young people who belong. In addition to this, we are conducting a series of visits to different places of worship, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, which is to include at least one visit to a Negro congregation, which we hope will contribute further to interfaith and interracial understanding.

Even in the South it has been possible in many places to form such groups. Where such a group has been in existence for some time and has a degree of community support, it should be able to challenge Jim Crow in carefully chosen places. Such a group would have several advantages which Mr. Houser's group did not have. In the first place, it would have a name known to a good many people in the community. "This is the Doeville Youth Council. Since we represent all the churches in town, of course we're interracial." The fact that the group has a degree of sponsorship by the various churches carries some weight. Such a group can be quite sizeable, and, as an opening wedge, might agree to completely take over some public place such as a small theater or a small restaurant for the evening. Such a move as this would have the value of demonstrating to a skeptical manager that an interracial group can meet in a peaceable and respectable manner. Other advantages of "respectable" backing for interracial groups will become apparent.

CLARENDON HYDE.

---

### Cautious Ministers

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

John Haynes Holmes, for whose loving kindness I am grateful beyond words, on his page in August FELLOWSHIP controverts my opinion why fewer pacifist ministers have been ousted from their pastorates in the present world war than in the former, though they are much more numerous.

He quotes a published letter of mine: "The reason, I think, is not that parishes are more tolerant, but rather that ministers are more cautious." My succeeding words he did not quote, perhaps as not in good taste. But they are pertinent in this rejoinder: "Too damned cautious!"

The rural pastor whom Dr. Holmes describes, "denouncing this war as the work of the devil, indicting conscription as 'selective slavery,' and calling unceasingly for 'peace now,'" is not typical. I suspect, despite Dr. Holmes' assertion to the contrary, that he is "a lonely figure." May his tribe increase! The typical pacifist minister today believes that there is a time for speech against war and a time for silence or near-silence about it, the latter being now and for the duration. We are dumb dogs. (Isa. 56:10.) We cannot bark.

I say *we,* for my complaint includes myself. I have been more outspoken than some of my pacifist brother ministers. I ought to be. My life is practically over, my work done. No one is dependent on me. I may claim to be a fit candidate for martyrdom, even as was an old man named Socrates. Yet, I recall that Jesus was still a young man when he accepted the cross.

Dr. Holmes pronounced judgment on the men of his own age-group, ministers and laymen, pacifists and non-pacifists, when he ridiculed the spectacle they presented on April 27, 1942, as follows (*Unity,* July, 1944): "There was the hysteria over registration. In the wake of Selective Service, it was suddenly ordered that all men up to sixty-five years of age should be enrolled . . . and on a certain day we all had to go tottering to the booths and enroll our names. Not a thing was done with these older men—nothing has been heard of the registration since it was taken. But we went through it like so many nincompoops frightened at their own shadows."

To Christian pacifists, was not the requirement to register as the President proclaimed, "to insure victory, final and complete, over the enemies of the United States," virtually a command to turn their backs on Christ and bow respectfully to Caesar? Of the thousands of ministers who had, after the first world war, declared their determination never voluntarily to participate in or support war, how many refused to obey the mandate to register? Exactly four, and of those four only two were at the time in charge of parishes!

Think what the effect would have been if a thousand of them, or a hundred, or fifty, or even a smaller number if it included some of wide distinction as religious leaders, had refused. If merely the galaxy of pacifist pastors in New York City—Holmes, Fosdick, Buttrick, Bowie, Chalmers, Elliott, Lathrop, McKee, Scherer, Sockman—had refused, cheerfully accepting the probability of a jail sentence, the whole country would have been stirred, and the thirdtermite in the White House (now a would-be fourthtermite) would have received the salutary jolt he needs.

"Like so many nincompoops frightened at their own shadows"—you said it, my dearly beloved and deeply admired Holmes, not I.

HENRY W. PINKHAM.

---

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

In reading the final section of our series of three articles in FELLOWSHIP, published in the June issue, we have noticed that a cut in our manuscript, which was quite understandable, has nevertheless unwittingly distorted one of the crucial points we desired to convey. In summing up the things that needed to be done in peace work inside the Latin American countries, we said: "Quakers and workers from several other religious and social groups have done a great deal in Mexico to batter down, by means of their desire to be of simple usefulness, the ancient prejudices. They have been wise in seeking projects which involve sacrifical labor of hands, undertakings that speak a message the most unsophisticated peasant can be brought to understand."

The value of such work we would enthusiastically recommend. However, we went on to say: "If such workers suffered any handicaps, these have been rooted in the lack of intellectual drive and the lack of attention to the dominant economic and political issues which, after all, can scarcely be ignored. Sometimes the best of work has failed to find a focal point where it could meet on a common level the educated leaders of thought, who, after all, must determine policy for many years to come. On the other hand, post-war planners and elaborate program-makers too often have attached themselves to officials whom they wished to infuse with progressive international objectives, but have come in contact with the ordinary people not at all."

We stress this point because, in our considered judgment, both types of work are equally necessary. In practical experience, however, work projects have been carried out almost exclusively, and we believe that in the future efforts of a more direct educational nature, especially in the spirit of internationalism, are also urgently required.

JOSEPH M. GOODMAN,
DEVERE ALLEN.

# FOR Conferences Cover the Nation

## Annual Fall Conferences to Be Held in Seven Cities During September and October

New York, Sept. 1.—(FOR)—This year again the Fellowship of Reconciliation is holding a series of fall conferences across the country in order to make it possible for a large number of members to attend without traveling too far from home.

These regional conferences will be planned to meet the special needs and interests of the areas in which they are held, but each conference will also receive reports from the national officers, make nominations for members of the National Council, and discuss the national FOR program for the year to come.

Those who wish to attend any conference but are not able to pay for regular hotel accommodations should not allow that fact to keep them away. At all of the conferences accommodations in private homes at reasonable rates will be available, and a limited number of free accommodations will be offered those whose attendance depends upon such help. This applies especially to CPS men, ex-CPS men, and COs who have served prison terms; they will be given all possible aid. Requests for such entertainment, however, should be received well in advance of the conferences by the persons designated below.

Plans for the Eastern Conference in New York and the Midwestern Conference in Chicago call for some unusual features on the program, including action projects to be undertaken by conferees, and a demonstration of pacifism and the arts by musical and dramatic talent. Such features may also be included on other conference programs.

Following is a list of the conferences and correspondents. All conferences will convene on Friday evening and continue through the following Sunday noon.

*Eastern Conference:* New York, Sept. 22-24. Write to: John Swomley, Jr., 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

*Midwestern Conference:* Chicago, Sept. 29-Oct. 1. Write to: Emerson Schwenk, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Ill.

*Southern Conference:* Nashville, Tenn., Oct. 6-8. Write to: Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville 4, Tenn.

*Rocky Mountain Conference:* Denver, Oct. 6-8. Write to: Margaret Rohrer, 1418 Grape Street, Denver Colorado.

*Pacific Northwest Conference:* Seattle, Oct. 13-15. Write to: Mary U. Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.

*Northern California Conference:* San Francisco, Oct. 20-22. Write to: Caleb Foote, 2151 Vine St., Berkeley 7, Calif.

*Pacific Southwest Conference:* Los Angeles, Oct. 27-29. Write to: Mrs. Glenn Smiley, 1837 N. Berendo, Los Angeles 27, Calif.


# Have You Read These 10 Best Sellers

of the FOR Literature Department?

**During the past month the following ten publications have topped all others in our literature department sales. There's a reason. Each one has a significant message. Read them and see for yourself.**

***Peace Is the Victory*** ..... **$1.50**
By 13 Christian pacifists on problems of the peace.

***The Next Peace*** ..... **.25**
By R. Alfred Hassler. In youth or adult edition.

***Political Theories of Pacifism*** ..... **.25**
By Mulford Sibley. Analysis of chief types of pacifism.

***The Fall of Christianity*** ..... **1.50**
By Heering. Scholarly discussion of church, state, war.

***The Races of Mankind*** ..... **.10**
By Benedict & Weltfish. Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 85.

***With the Master*** ..... **.75**
By Vernier. Beautiful, inspiring devotional readings.

***Humiliation with Honor*** ..... **1.00**
By Vera Brittain. An excellent introduction to pacifism.

***The New Testament Basis of Pacifism*** ..... **.50**
By Macgregor. Convincing study of Scripture passages.

***Outcasts*** ..... **.15**
By Caleb Foote. Complete study of Japanese relocation.

***Say Yes to the Light*** ..... **1.50**
By Allan Hunter. A plea to take Jesus' teachings seriously.

Check them off and send your order NOW!

## FIGHT CONSCRIPTION

Here is your ammunition. Two new pamphlets that you will want to read and pass along to your friends. Buy as many copies as you can afford, and give them away where they will do the most good.

•

**"Should the United States Adopt Permanent Military CONSCRIPTION?"**

Statements of 12 religious, educational, and civic groups.

**15¢ a dozen — 100 for $1.00**

•

**"PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION"**

Brief but comprehensive answers to several of the most common questions.

**35¢ a dozen — 50 for $1.00**

•

**Why not organize your local FOR group to carry out community-wide distribution of these?**

## DON'T MISS THESE

*A Preface to Prayer...* **$2.00**
Gerald Heard's latest, on the understanding of prayer.

*Peace Through Cooperation* ..... **1.25**
J. Henry Carpenter. The role of cooperatives in peace.

*Introduction to Non-violence* ..... **.25**
Theodore Paullin's analysis of non-violent techniques.

*The Negro in America.* **.10**
Summary of Myrdal's $7.50 book, "An American Dilemma."

*What About Our Japanese-Americans?* **.10**
Carey McWilliams. Latest Public Affairs Pamphlet.

**THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION**
***Literature Department,* 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.**